

REMARKS

This is meant to be a complete response to the Office Action mailed October 4, 2004. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Applicants' claims 22-42 under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶1 and under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶2.

Applicants' Response to the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶1 Rejection

In the Office Action dated October 4, 2004, the Examiner rejected Applicants' claims 22-42 under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶1. In support of the rejection, the Examiner stated:

The specification, while being enabling for creating an MHC class I complex by the claimed method, does not reasonably provide enablement for creating an MHC class II complex by the claimed method.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, and respectfully submit that the Specification of the subject application fully enables and discloses Class I AND Class II MHC complexes, and thus are fully within the scope of the present invention as presently claimed. However, for the sake of expediting issuance of a patent from the subject application, the claims have been amended herein to recite "soluble *Class I* MHC complexes". Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims have overcome the 35 USC 112, ¶1 rejection thereof. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶1 rejection of the claims.

Applicants' Response to the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶2 Rejection

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 22-42 under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶2, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

In support of the rejection, the Examiner stated:

Claims 22, 28 and 35 are each vague and ambiguous in the recitation of "native" beta-2-microglobulin. The term "native" is ambiguous in that could mean native to the cell, a molecule in its native conformation or a molecule that is native in its binding to the recombinant MHC class I α chain.

In response to the rejection, claims 22, 28 and 35 have been amended herein to recite that "the beta-2-microglobulin is native to and endogenously expressed in the host cell". Applicants respectfully submit that claims 22-42, as now amended, are definite and particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶2 rejection of claims 22-42 as now amended.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that this application, as now amended, is in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above. Therefore, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider each and every rejection as applicable to the claims now pending in the application and pass such claims to issue.

This amendment is intended to be a complete response to the Office Action dated October 4, 2004. In the event that any outstanding issues remain that would delay the allowance of this application, the examiner is urged to contact the undersigned to telephonically discuss such outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas J. Sorocco, Reg. No. 43,145
DUNLAP, CODDING & ROGERS, P.C.
Post Office Box 16370
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73113
(405) 607-8600 - Telephone
(405) 607-8686 - Telefax

Attorney for Applicant